EXHIBIT A

D by Macomb County Circuit Court 6/21/2024	*			2024-002378-1 LAZZERI, BRI
6/21/2024 Approved, SCAO	Original - Court 1st copy - Defendant		2nd copy - Plaintiff 3rd copy - Return	
STATE OF MICHIGAN JUDICIAL DISTRICT 16th JUDICIAL CIRCUIT	SUMMONS	202	CASE NO. 4-2378 NP	:
Macomb COUNTY		Hor	a k	·
Court address 40 N. Main Street, Mt. Clemens, MI 48043	,		586-469-	phone no. : 7171
Plaintiff's name, address, and telephone no.		Defendant's name, address,	and telephone no.	· ;
BRIAN LAZZERI	v	RAVIN CROSSBOWS, VELOCITY OUTDOOR		
Plaintiffs attorney, bar no., address, and telephol NATHAN J. EDMONDS (P51453) Ven Johnson Law, PLC 535 Griswold St., Suite 2600 Detroit, MI 48226	пе по.			
(313) 342-8300				
Instructions: Check the items below that apply to if necessary, a case Inventory addendum (MC 2*			court clark along with your com	plaint and,
There are no pending or resolved ca family members of the person(s) wh There is one or more pending or res the family or family members of the confidential case inventory (MC 21) it is unknown if there are pending or the family or family members of the	o are the subject of the comple ofved cases within the jurisdict person(s) who are the subject issuing those cases.	aint. tion of the family division of the complaint. I have	n of the circuit court invol	ving eted
[韓國 400 数 10 90 11 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12				75
Civil Case. ☐ This is a business case in which all. ☐ MDHHS and a contracted health pia the complaint will be provided to MD ☐ There is no other pending or resolve ☐ Complaint. ☐ A civil action between these parties	in may have a right to recover of the color	expenses in this case. ntracted health plan in same transaction or oc	I certify that notice and a accordance with MCL 400 acurrence as alleged in th	copy of : 0.108(4). e
Veo Johnson: 53/béen previously filed in Dithis cou	rt, 🗆		Cou	rt, where
beroji 34 44 Glit was given case number	and assigned	d to Judge	WHITE CO.	ed by
The action	nger pending.	•	18	E
Surprisons section completed by court clerk.	SUMMONS			
NOTICE TO THE DEFENDANT: In the 1. YOU are being sued. 2. YOU HAVE 21 DAYS after receiving	this summons and a copy of t	he complaint to file a v	ritten answer with the	
and serve a copy on the other party were served outside of Michigan). 3. If you do not answer or take other and demanded in the complaint. 4. If you require accommodations to us to help you fully participate in court i	ction within the time allowed, ju	idgment may be entere	d against you for the relie foreign language interpre	ef ter
lasue data	9-24 Court clark	140	11	1141
This summons is invalid unless served on or be	fore its expiration date. This document	must be sealed by the seal	: 1 The court. 3. FORLINI 2(B), MCR 2.103, MCR 2.104, M	
MC bří (323) SUMMONS		MCH 1.109(D), MCR 2.10	ζ(в), MCR 2.103, MCR 2.104 _{.,} l	ACR 2.105
Pagagony mayor				

91 (31.60)	•					\$
- 40 11	201				Case No. 2024-	NP
mmons (3/2	ప)				Case No.	
		(a)	ROOF OF SERV	ICE		
O PROCES ne expiratio ne court cle	n date on the summo	st serve the sumr ns. If you are una	nons and compla ble to complete s	int and file prod ervice, you mu	of of service with the co st return this original a	ourt clerk before nd all copies to
		CERTIFICAT	E OF SERVICE /	NONSERVICE		
	personally [ssee (copy of return into listed below, on:	by registered or beceipt attached)	certified mail, re a copy of the s	tum receipt req ummons and th	uested, and delivery re ne complaint, together	estricted to the with the
i have atte been una	empted to serve a co ble to complete servi	py of the summor se on:	s and complaint,	together with t	he attachments listed t	pelow, and have
Name				Date	and time of service	
Place or address	ss of service					
dia obs (2)	, s.					25 FF
Attachments (I	any)					
perjury th	pally competent adult at this certificate of so on, knowledge, and b	ervice has been e	or an officer of a xamined by me a	corporate part nd that its cont	y. I declare under the pents are true to the be	enalties of st of my
Service (ee	Miles traveled	Fee	7	Signature		73.3.1.
ncorrect addre	ss fee Miles traveled	Fee	TOTAL FEE	Name (type	e or print)	1915
Hawar 4	man Fig.	\$.	\$			wh.e
pusta (a).		*				
-	25.	ACKNO	WLEDGMENT O	FSERVICE		
acknowled	ge that I have receive	ed service of a co	py of the summor	ns and complai	nt, together with	
Attachments (i	(any)			On Date and	lime	
Und Spring	,					***
Ignature	The second second		on behalf	of		
ame (type or	ndat)					·
lame (type or 点,マスコァ	general,					900
J. James her		* *				141
ungjarv o Mormos					8	1
CL'600.1910,	MCR 2.104, MCR 2.105					
* 950 C						ala Na
* * ¥						- 75.
e se s						

FILED by Macomb County Circuit Court 6/21/2024

. '..

2024-002378-NP LAZZERI, BRIAN V

STATE OF MICHIGAN

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT FOR THE COUNTY OF MACOMB

BRIAN LAZZERI

Plaintiff,

Case No. 24-002378-NP Hon. Joseph Toia

RAVIN CROSSBOWS, LLC and VELOCITY OUTDOOR, INC.

Defendants.

NATHAN J. EDMONDS (P51453)

VEN. R. JOHNSON (P39219)

VEN JOHNSON LAW, PLC

Attorneys for Plaintiff

The Buhl Building

535 Griswold Ste 2600

Detroit, Michigan 48226

(313) 324-8300

nedmonds@venjohnsonlaw.com

C112.7

COMPLAINT AND JURY DEMAND

There are no pending civil actions arising out of the same transaction or occurrence as alleged in this Complaint.

/s/ Nathan J. Edmonds Nathan J. Edmonds (P51453)

1. The Plaintiff, Brian Lazzeri, is a resident of Shelby Township, County of Michigan

State of Michigan.

RAVIETO PE VELVE DE SE

2. Defendant, Ravin Crossbows, LLC (herein after referred to as "Ravin") is believed to be a limited liability company with a principal place of business at 3535 Tower Avenue;

Superior, Wisconsin, 54880.

- 3. Defendant, Velocity Outdoor, Inc., (herein after referred to as "Velocity Outdoor") is a corporation incorporated in a state other than Michigan with a principal place of business of 7629 State 5 and 20, Bloomfield, New York, 14469.
 - 4. Defendant, Ravin, is a manufacturer and seller of Ravin crossbows and bolts.
- Defendant, Velocity Outdoor, is believed to be a holding company, which owns
 Defendant, Ravin Crossbows, LLC.
- 6. On October 1, 2022, the Plaintiff was injured when he fired a Ravin, bolt from a Ravin, model 10, Crossbow (serial # 10.A072598), while hunting for the first time, after having sighted the bow, having fired a bod 10-15 times previously.
- The Ravin Crossbow and bolt that the Plaintiff fired, was purchased by Justin Goltarski from Dunham's something in 2022.
- 8. The crossbow and bolt were manufactured by Defendant, Ravin, and the Ravin name and model number are displayed on the crossbow.
- 9. The Defendant, Ravin, sold the crossbow and bolt in question to Dunham so that Dunham's could sell the crossbow and bolt to the public.
- 10. The Ravin bolt was fired, was also manufactured by Defendant Ravin and the Ravin name is displayed on the Ravin bolt.
- 11. On the morning of October 1, 2022, the Plaintiff fired the Ravin Crossbow from a tree stand at a deer, being the first time after sighting the bow that it was used for hunting.
- 12. The Plaintiff is a righthanded shooter and therefore he was holding the crossbow to his right shoulder, with his right hand on the pistol grip, and he pulled the trigger with his right, index finder.

Addition ...

25,74.0

- 13. The Plaintiff's left hand was supporting the crossbow at the proper location, under the forearm of the crossbow.
- 14. When the Plaintiff fired the crossbow, the crossbow malfunctioned, and the string severed.
- 15. As a direct and proximate result of the malfunction, the severed string whipped forward with such force that it struck, fractured and lacerated the Plaintiff's proximal phalange of the long finger of his right hand.
 - 16. Pieces of the fired bolt were later recovered.
- 17. The Plaintiff received medical treatment including x-rays, surgery, prescription medications, physical therapy, and follow up doctor visits.
- 18. The Plaintiff incurred medical expenses in excess of \$130,000 and he may incur additional medical expenses in the future.
- 19. The Plaintiff was unable to work because of his injuries from the incident and incurred lost wages.
- 20. As a direct and proximate result of this incident the Plaintiff has experienced physical pain and suffering, mental anguish, anxiety, inconvenience, discomfort and loss of enjoyment of life, which may continue indefinitely in the future.

COUNT I - PRODUCTS LIABILITY-DEFECTIVE DESIGN

- 21. Paragraphs 1-20 of Plaintiff's Complaint are incorporated herein by reference as though fully set forth at length.
- 22. In 2022, Defendant Ravin was in the business of designing, manufacturing and selling Ravin Crossbow's and bolts of the kind involved in Plaintiff's incident.

inco

- 23. Defendant, Ravin, designed and manufactured the Ravin Crossbow model R10 (serial #10.A072598), and the Ravin bolt that were involved in Plaintiff's incident.
- 24. At the time that the Defendant, Ravin, designed, manufactured and sold the crossbow and bolt in question and place it in the stream of commerce, it was defective and unfit for its intended use because:
 - The bowstring was susceptible to severing and breaking when the crossbow was fired;
 - b. The Ravin nock and/or the bolt itself were defective in that they were susceptible to fracturing and breaking when fired from the Ravin Crossbow;
 - The defective nock and/or bolt created a risk of the bowstring severing and breaking when the crossbow is fired;
 - d. The crossbow limbs are under such tension, that when the bowstrings break there is a significant danger of injury to the user.
- 25. As a direct and proximate result of the defects referred to in paragraphs 24 above, the Plaintiff suffered the injuries and damage summarized in paragraphs 17-20 above.

WHEREFORE, the Plaintiff respectfully requests that judgment be entered in his favor for its the state of the

COUNT II - PRODUCTS LIABILITY-DEFECTIVE DESIGN

- 26. Paragraphs 1-25 of Plaintiff's Complaint are incorporated herein by reference as though fully set forth at length.
- 27. The Defendant, Velocity Outdoor, Inc., was the owner and/or parent company of Ravin, who was selling Ravin Crossbows to the public, including the Crossbow of the kind involved in the Plaintiff's incident.
- 28. At all times relevant hereto, Defendant, Velocity Outdoor, managed, operated and controlled Defendant, Ravin Crossbows.

4

ggain

- 29. At all times relevant hereto, Defendant, Ravin, as agents, servants and/or employees of the Defendant, Velocity Outdoor, Inc.
- 30. Consequently, Defendant, Velocity Outdoor, Inc., is vicariously liable for the actions and/or inactions of Ravin Crossbows.
- 31. At the time that the Defendant, Ravin, designed, manufactured, assembled and sold the crossbow and bolt in question it was defective and unfit for its intended use because:
 - The bowstring was susceptible to severing and breaking when the crossbow was fired;
 - The Ravin nock and/or the bolt itself were defective in that they were susceptible to fracturing and breaking when fired from the Ravin Crossbow;
 - The defective nock and/or bolt created a risk of the bowstring severing and breaking when the crossbow is fired;
 - d. The crossbow limbs are under such tension, that when the bowstrings break there is a significant danger of injury to the user.
- 32. As a direct result of the defects referred to in paragraph 30 above, the Plaintiff suffered the injuries and damages summarized in paragraphs 17-20 above.

WHEREFORE, the Plaintiff respectfully requests that judgment be entered in his favor and against Defendant, Velocity Outdoor, Inc., in an amount in excess of the jurisdictional requirements for compulsory arbitration.

COUNT III - PRODUCTS LIABILITY-FAILURE TO WARN

- 33. Paragraphs 1-32 of Plaintiff's Complaint are incorporated herein by reference as though fully set forth at length.
- 34. The Defendant, Rayin, failed to warn the Plaintiff that the crossbow's bowstring was susceptible to severing and breaking when the crossbow was fired.

erij (h

gh_ide tos vozei Ala

- 35. The Defendant, Ravin, failed to warn the Plaintiff that the Ravin nock and/or the bolt itself were defective in that they were susceptible to fracturing and breaking when fired from the Ravin Crossbow.
- 36. The Defendant, Ravin, failed to warn the Plaintiff that the defective nock and/or bolt constituted a risk that the bowstring could sever and break when the crossbow is fired.
- 37. The Defendant, Ravin, failed to warn the Plaintiff that the crossbow limbs are under such tension, that when the bowstring breaks there is a significant danger of injury to the user.
- 38. As a direct and proximate result of the Defendant, Ravin's failure to warn of the conditions referred to in paragraphs 33-36 above, the Plaintiff suffered the injuries and damages summarized in paragraphs 17-20 above.

WHEREFORE, The Plaintiff respectfully requests that judgment be entered in his favor and against Defendant, Ravin, in an amount in excess of \$25,000.

COUNT IV - PRODUCTS LIABILITY - FAILURE TO WARN

- 39. Paragraphs 1-38 of Plaintiff's Complaint are incorporated herein by reference as though fully set forth at length.
- 40. The Defendant, Velocity Outdoor Inc., was the owner and/or parent company of Ravin Crossbows, LLC, who sells Ravin Crossbows to the public, including the Crossbow involved in this incident.
- 41. At all times relevant hereto, Defendant, Velocity Outdoor, managed Defendant, Ravin Crossbows.
- 42. At all times relevant hereto, Defendant, Ravin, acted by and through their employees, servants and agents who were acting as agents, servants and/or employees of the Defendant, Velocity Outdoor, Inc.

Man 5

- 43. Consequently, Defendant, Velocity Outdoor, Inc., is liable, and/or vicariously liable for the actions and/or inactions of Ravin Crossbows, and is liable for Ravin Crossbow's failure to warn, as is enumerated in paragraphs 43.
- 44. The Defendant, Ravin, failed to warn the Plaintiff that the crossbow's bowstring was susceptible to severing and breaking when the crossbow was fired.
- 45. The Defendant, Ravin, failed to warn the Plaintiff that the Ravin nock and/or the bolt itself were defective in that they were susceptible to fracturing and breaking when fired from the Ravin Crossbow.
- 46. The Defendant, Ravin, failed to warn the Plaintiff that the defective nock and/or bolt constituted a risk that the bowstring could sever and break when the cross bow is fired.
- 47. The Defendant, Ravin, failed to warn the Plaintiff that the crossbow limbs are under such tension, that when the bowstring breaks there is a significant danger of injury to the user.
- 48. As a direct and proximate result of the Defendant, Ravin's failure to warn of the conditions referred to in paragraphs 33-36 above, the Plaintiff suffered the injuries and damages summarized in paragraphs 17-20 above.

WHEREFORE, the Plaintiff respectfully requests that judgment be entered in his favor and against Defendant, Velocity Outdoors, Inc., in an amount in excess of \$25,000.

COUNT V - NEGLIGENCE

the Property

Constitution of the second

tija Antoning geren

- 49. Paragraphs 1-48 of Plaintiff's Complaint are incorporated herein by reference as though fully set forth at length.
- 50. In 2022, Defendant, Ravin, was in the business of designing, manufacturing, assembling and selling Ravin Crossbow's and bolts of the kind involved in Plaintiff's incident.

7

- Defendant, Ravin, designed and manufactured the Ravin Crossbow model R10 (serial #10.A072598), and the Ravin bolt that were involved in Plaintiff's incident.
- 52. At the time that the Defendant, Ravin, designed, manufactured and sold the crossbow and bolt in question, Defendant, Ravin, owed a duty to the Plaintiff to design, manufacture and assemble Ravin model R10 Crossbow in a manner that made it safe for its intended use.
 - 53. Ravin breached their duty and were negligence for the following reasons:
 - The bowstring was susceptible to severing and breaking when the crossbow was fired;
 - The Ravin nock and/or the bolt itself were defective in that they were susceptible to fracturing and breaking when fired from the Ravin Crossbow;
- c. The defective nock and/or bolt created a risk of the bowstring severing and breaking when the crossbow is fired;
 - d. The crossbow limbs are under such tension, that when the bowstrings break there is a significant danger of injury to the user.
- 54. As a direct and proximate result of the negligence referred to in paragraphs 53 above, the Plaintiff suffered the injuries and damages summarized in paragraphs 1-20 above.

programme a

 $g_{P^{\alpha}P^{\alpha}}(a) = i \otimes$

WHEREFORE, the Plaintiff respectfully requests that judgment be entered in his favor and against Defendant, Ravin, in an amount in excess of \$25,000.

COUNT VI - NEGLIGENCE

- 55. Paragraphs 1-54 of Plaintiff's Complaint are incorporated herein by reference as though fully set forth at length.
- The Defendant, Velocity Outdoor, Inc., was the owner and/or parent company of Ravin, who was in the business of designing, manufacturing, assembling and selling Ravin Crossbows to the public.

- 57. At all times relevant hereto, Defendant, Velocity Outdoor, supervised, managed, operated and controlled Defendant Ravin Crossbows.
- 58. At all times relevant hereto, Defendant, Ravin, acted by and through their employees, servants and agents who were acting as agents, servants and/or employees of the Defendant, Velocity Outdoor, Inc.
- 59. Consequently, Defendant, Velocity Outdoor, Inc., is liable, and/or vicariously liable for the actions and/or inactions of Ravin Crossbows and is liable for Ravin Crossbow's negligence as enumerated herein.
- 60. At the time that the Defendant, Ravin, designed, manufactured and sold the crossbow and bolt in question, Defendant, Ravin, owed a duty to the Plaintiff to design, manufacture and assemble Ravin model 10 Crossbow in a manner that made it safe for its intended continue.
- 61. Ravin breached their duty and were negligence for the following reasons:
- a. The bowstring was susceptible to severing and breaking when the crossbow was fired;
 - b. The Ravin nock and/or the bolt itself were defective in that they were susceptible to fracturing and breaking when fired from the Ravin Crossbow;
- $\frac{r_{OS}(t)}{as(en)}$ c. The defective nock and/or bolt created a risk of the bowstring severing and breaking when the crossbow is fired;
 - d. The crossbow limbs are under such tension, that when the bowstrings break there is a significant danger of injury to the user.

1995

62. As a direct and proximate result of the negligence referred to in paragraphs 61 above, the Plaintiff suffered the injuries and damages summarized in paragraphs 1-20 above.

WHEREFORE, the Plaintiff respectfully requests that judgment be entered in his favor and against Defendant, Ravin, in an amount in excess of \$25,000.

Respectfully Submitted,

VEN JOHNSON LAW, PLC

By: Io J. Nathan J. Edmands

NATHAN J. EDMONDS (P51453)

VEN R. JOHNSON (P39219)

Attorneys for Plaintiff

535 Griswold Street, Suite 2600

Detroit, Michigan 48226

Ph: (313) 324-8300 Fax (313) 324-8301

nedmonds@venjohnsonlaw.com

Date: June 8, 2024

Date 150

FILED by Macomb County Circuit Court 6/21/2024 2024-002378-NP LAZZERI, BRIAN V:

STATE OF MICHIGAN

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT FOR THE COUNTY OF MACOMB

BRIAN LAZZERI

Plaintiff,

Case No. 24-2378-NP Hon. Joseph Toia

RAVIN CROSSBOWS, LLC and VELOCITY OUTDOOR, INC.

Defendants.

NATHAN J. EDMONDS (P51453)
VEN. R. JOHNSON (P39219)
VEN JOHNSON LAW, PLC
Attorneys for Plaintiff
The Buhl Building
535 Griswold Ste 2600
Detroit, Michigan 48226
(313) 324-8300
nedmonds@venjohnsonlaw.com

PLAINTIFF'S DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

RAY FRA

1 ; -:

into

1, 1

Con

100

VEH C Plaintiff Brian Lazzeri, by and through his attorneys, Ven Johnson Law, PLC, hereby

demand trial by jury.

Respectfully Submitted,

VEN JOHNSON LAW, PLC

By:

Iel Nathan J. Edmondo
NATHAN J. EDMONDS (P51453)
VEN R. JOHNSON (P39219)
Attorneys for Plaintiff
535 Griswold Street, Suite 2600
Detroit, Michigan 48226

Ph: (313) 324-8300 Fax (313) 324-8301

nedmonds@venjohnsonlaw.com

Date: June 18, 2024

dens